

REMARKS

In the Office Action, The Examiner rejected claims 34-48 and 50-55 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In the Office Action, the Examiner allowed claim 49. In this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 34, 35, 41-42, 50 and 55. However, Applicants have not added or cancelled any claims. Accordingly, claims 34-55 will be pending in the application after entry of this Amendment.

I. Allowable Matter

In this Office Action, the Examiner allowed claim 49. Applicants respectfully thank the Examiner for the allowance of this claim.

II. Claims 34-48 and 50-55

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 34-48 and 50-55 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. In all these claims, the Examiner's rejection revolves around the following assertions. The Examiner asserts that a net represents a connection between elements, may also represent a connection between elements that are routed, and therefore it is unclear how a net can have a set of routable elements. The Examiner also asserted that the relation between the net having a set of routable elements and the rest of the claim language is unclear. Additionally, the Examiner recommended revising the phrase "wherein each net within the set has a set of routable elements". The Examiner also recommended deleting or revising the phrase "set of sub-regions that contain the set of routable elements of the particular net" to "set of sub-regions that contain a set of routable elements."

Applicants thank the Examiner for the Examiner's suggestions. Applicants strongly believe the use of the terms net and route in the claims conforms with the commonly understood

definition of these terms in the industry. Applicants understand that a “net” is a collection of routable elements that need to be electrically connected, while a “route” electrically connects the routable elements. *See, e.g.*, page 3, lines 7-10, and page 4, lines 6-11 of the specification.

Nevertheless, Applicants have incorporated the Examiner’s suggestions in this amendment and eliminated references to nets. Applicants respectfully maintain that such amendments are not for purposes of patentability (as the terminology of the claims was clear and definite before these amendments) but rather for the purpose of moving the prosecution of the application forward.

In accordance with the above arguments, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 34-48 and 50-55 are in condition for allowance. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the §112, second paragraph rejection of claim 34-48 and 50-55.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that all pending claims, namely claims 34-55 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested. Allowance is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date.

Dated: 11/1/05

Respectfully submitted,
STATTLER, JOHANSEN & ADELI LLP

Mani Adeli
Reg. No. 39,585

Stattler Johansen & Adeli LLP
1875 Century Park East, Suite 1050
Century City, CA 90067-2337
Phone: (310) 785-0140 x301
Fax: (310) 785-9558